

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2835/306097.01
Application No.: 10/722,987
Office Action Dated: September 4, 2008

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed September 4, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Present Status of Patent Application

Claims 1, 6, 7, 25, 30, 31, and 44-52 are now pending in the present application. Of these pending claims, claims 1, 6, 7, 25, 30, and 31 are currently amended without introduction of new matter; claims 2-5, 8-24, 26-29, and 32-36 are canceled; and claims 44-52 are new claims being submitted without introduction of new matter. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of claims 37-43 in current Office action

The Office has withdrawn Applicant's claims 37-43 that were submitted as new claims in Applicant's response dated 11 June 2008. In providing a reason for the withdrawal, the Office action asserts that claims 37-43 are drawn to "*pattern matching*" whereas originally presented (and examined) claims were drawn to "*query processing (searching)*."

In response thereto, Applicant hereby submits claim amendments to withdrawn claims 37-42 (suitably identified as "Withdrawn – Currently amended") that are directed to bringing these claims in line with originally submitted claims, vis-à-vis "*query processing (searching)*."

Consequently, in light of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the withdrawal of these claims be rescinded and examination carried out upon these claims as well as other pending claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Statement of the Rejection

Claims 1-7, 10-12, 25-32, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0129012 A1, published: September 12,

2002), in view of *Beach et al. (Beach hereinafter) (US 2003/0014753 A1)*, and further in view of *Peter J. Tsakanikas (Tsakanikas hereinafter) (US 4,427,848)*.

Response to the Rejection

Claim 1

The Office action refutes Applicant's remarks submitted in Applicant's response dated 11 June 2008. Applicant does not agree with several assertions made in this regard. However, in the interests of moving forward prosecution in the case, Applicant has opted to currently amend claim 1 and respectfully asserts that the cited prior art, individually and/or in combination fails to reasonably teach or disclose various portions of the amended claim.

For example, a first of such portions of amended claim 1, cites: "*a plurality of text strings and a corresponding plurality of numeric strings, wherein each of the plurality of numeric strings is formed by matching each individual letter contained in a text string with a corresponding number located on the same alphanumeric key.*"

This aspect has been described by Applicant in his original specification, for example in his paragraph [0046], which teaches: "*An example embodying steps 510-560 is further illustrated in Figure 6. In this example, each character in "Steven" may be looked up in table 300 to find the corresponding key on keypad 200. In this example, 'S' corresponds to key 7 on keypad 200, 'T' corresponds to key 8 on keypad 200, 'E' corresponds to key 3 on keypad 200, 'V' corresponds to key 8 on keypad 200, 'E' corresponds to key 3 on keypad 200, and 'N' corresponds to key 6 on keypad 200. String B may then be computed by appending the resulting characters together. The resulting value of String B is "783836".*"

The cited combination of references fails to suggest or teach this and other portions of the claim. In this regard, it may be pertinent to draw attention to the cited reference of Green, which discloses a lexicon. Green's lexicon is distinctly different from Applicant's text strings and numeric strings that are recited in amended claim 1 and taught in Applicant's paragraph [0046] reproduced above. A relevant portion of Green's paragraph [0031] is reproduced below for ease of reference.

[0031] ... Referring to FIG. 4, it will be noted that each entry in column one of the word look-up table 24 identifies a specific starting character and a specific word length.

Corresponding entries in columns two and three identify lower and upper bounds, respectively, for a range of consecutive word numbers whose associated words begin with the specified character and conform to the specified word length. For example, the character-length value "a2" in column one identifies a set of two-character words that begin with the letter "a." The corresponding entries in columns two and three define the associated word number range 2 to 2, which identifies a single-member set consisting of the word "as." For the character-length entry "s3", the word look-up table 24 identifies consecutive word numbers 16-18 which identify a three-member set consisting of the words "sam", "sun" and "set."

Combining Green with the other references does not reasonably result in Applicant's "matching each individual letter contained in a text string with a corresponding number located on the same alphanumeric key." Furthermore, the cited combination of references, individually and/or combinedly, fails to teach or suggest certain search aspects that are included in amended claim 1.

Applicant's search aspects of claim 1 are directed towards searching numeric strings in order to provide a faster search for text. In this matter, it may be pertinent to draw attention to Applicant's paragraph [0048], which discloses: "It is appreciated that saving "783836", along with the name "Steven" will allow the user to quickly retrieve the record later by prefix searching on the value of the key pressed, rather than multiple prefix searches using the set of characters the key represents" (emphasis added). Applicant's efficient search process is in contrast to prior art searches as taught by Tsakanikas and described in Applicant's Background section (paragraph [0002] for example).

In light of the remarks above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

Claims 2-5 and 10-12

Applicant has currently canceled claims 2-5 and 10-12 and respectfully submits that the rejection of these claims has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

Claims 6 and 7

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons cited above. Consequently, claims 6 and 7 that are dependent directly or indirectly on

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2835/306097.01
Application No.: 10/722,987
Office Action Dated: September 4, 2008

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

claim 1 are also allowable as a matter of law. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).
Applicant hereby requests withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claims 6 and 7.

Claim 25

In contrast to claim 1, which is a method claim, Applicant's claim 25 is a system claim. Consequently, the scope of these two claims is distinct and different. However, certain remarks made above with reference to the rejection of claim 1 are equally pertinent to the rejection of claim 25 as well. In the interests of brevity, these remarks will not be repeated herein and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is also allowable at least in currently amended form. Consequently, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

Claims 26-29, 32, and 34-36

Applicant has currently canceled claims 26-29, 32, and 34-36 and respectfully submits that the rejection of these claims has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

Claims 30 and 31

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 25 is allowable for at least the reasons cited above. Consequently, claims 30 and 31 that are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 25 are also allowable as a matter of law. Applicant hereby requests withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Cited Art Made of Record

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2835/306097.01
Application No.: 10/722,987
Office Action Dated: September 4, 2008

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1, 6, 7, 25, 30, 31, and 44-52 are allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative at (215) 568-3100.

Date: December 3, 2008

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439